UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,569	09/08/2005	Gil Sam Park	026032-4821	8358
	7590 01/30/200 LARDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 500	T NIU	MCPARTLIN, SARAH BURNHAM		
3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3636	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/509,569	PARK, GIL SAM			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		SARAH B. MCPARTLIN	3636			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Oc</u>	ctober 2008				
	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
′=	/ 					
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	·	A painte quayie, 1000 0.21 11, 10	0 0.0.2.0.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 5-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	on Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2004 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/509,569 Page 2

Art Unit: 3636

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 5-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Nishino (4,738,427) in view of Niezoldt (5,791,738). Nishino discloses a seat for a vehicle (Figure 3): comprising: a pair of support frames (8)(8) supported by the vehicle body; a seat back (1)(A) including a seat back frame (1); a reclining device (6) configured to allow the seat back (1)(A) to tilt and support the seat back (1)(A) in a tilting position, the reclining device (6) being supported by an installed on the support frames (8)(8); and a lifter device (3) configured to allow a seat cushion portion (2)(A) to tip up and support the seat cushion portion (2)(A) in a tipping position, the lifter device (3) being supported by and installed on the support frames (8)(8) wherein the reclining device (6) comprises a device mechanism and covers lower ends of the seat back frame (1) as best depicted in Figure 3. The lower end of the seat back frame (1) is supported

The lifter device (3) comprises a first sector gear (20) and a second gear (19) to allow the seat cushion portion (2)(A) to tip up and support the seat cushion portion (2)(A) in a tipping position. The lifter (3) further comprises a first projection (17) and a second projection (22) on an inner portion (unlabeled) of the first and second support

Art Unit: 3636

members (8). The gear (second gear) (19) is pivotally supported on the first projection (17) and the sector gear (first gear) (20) is pivotally supported in the second projection (22).

As disclosed above, Nishino reveals all claimed elements with the exception of a seat back frame made from a pipe/tube and sub-frames welded to the seat back fame and also made from pipes/tubes having upper cut ends and lower ends, wherein each lower end of the frame and sub-frames is spaced in the fore-aft direction and the reclining device falls within the space.

Niezoldt (5,791,738) discloses a seat back (1) including a first tubular/pipe frame (4) and a second tubular/pipe frame or sub-frame (3) having lower ends that are spaced apart in the fore-aft direction and a hook element (12) for receiving a reclining device, in the form of a swivel pin, which falls within the space between the lower ends of the first and second tubular frames. An upper end of the sub-frame (3) is welded to an upper portion of the seatback frame (4). The first (4) and second (3) frames are welded together at top portions (7)(6) as described in column 2, lines 35-40. Each of the sub-frames has an upper cut end as is best disclosed in Figure 1. The "upper cut" corresponds to a right angle cut out portion that receives an edge of reinforcement portion (8). This angle is capable of being formed by a cutting process and therefore constitutes an "upper cut end." A third frame (13) is welded at its ends to the first and second frames at a lower end thereof by way of hook element (12) which extends rearward of the lower ends of the first and second frame sin a fore-aft direction.

Art Unit: 3636

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to replace the seat back (1)(A) disclosed by Nishino with the seat back taught by Niezoldt. Such a modification would create "a considerable increase in the seat back's stability under load both towards the front and the back" (column 3, lines 2-3).

Response to Amendment/Arguments

3. Applicant's remarks and arguments filed on October 3, 2008 have been considered in their entirety.

Applicant argues that the Examiner's assertion that the right angle bent portion of each sub frame in Niezoldt constitutes a cut end because the angle is capable of being formed by a cutting process is inconsistent with the teachings of Niezoldt. Applicant argues that if the right angle bent portion was formed via a cutting process, flattened sections 6' and 7' would not be formed and would instead be replaced with a hole or gap in which separator (8) rests. The Examiner contends that the term "flattened sections" could in fact refer to a flattened edge section of a cut out in which the separator (8) rests. The language of the Niezoldt makes it undeterminable whether or not the angled portion if formed by bending or cutting. However, it is possible that the angled portion be formed by either bending OR cutting and therefore the Examiner maintains that the teachings of Niezoldt meet the product by process limitations of the claim. Applicant further argues that the broken lines shown in Niezoldt clearly indicate that the flattened sections are bent and not cut out. Again, the Examiner contends that

Application/Control Number: 10/509,569 Page 5

Art Unit: 3636

such broken lines could equally indicate a cut line or a bend line. Since the angled portion is CAPABLE of being formed by cutting, the Examiner maintains that the teachings of Niezoldt meet the product by process limitations of the claim. Finally, Applicant argues that using a cutting process to form the flattened sections would leave the frame weak and inoperable. The Examiner contends that the presence of separator (8) in the cut out portions would maintain the strength and integrity of the system. The Examiner maintains that the Nishino in view of Niezoldt rejection set forth above reads on the claimed invention.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARAH B. MCPARTLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-6854. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on 571-272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah B. McPartlin/ Examiner Art Unit 3636

SBM January 28, 2009